



William D. Reilich
Supervisor

TOWN OF GREECE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

DECEMBER 16, 2015

Work Session Began: 6:30 p.m.

Meeting Began: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Community Conference Room, Greece Town Hall

Present

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Richard C. Antelli

Daniel P. Barletta, DDS

Devan Helfer

William E. Selke

Michael H. Sofia

Christopher A. Schiano, Esq., Deputy Town Attorney

John Gauthier, P.E., Associate Engineer

Scott R. Copey, Planner

Michelle M. Betters, Planning Board Secretary

Absent

Christine R. Burke

Additions, Deletions and Continuances to the Agenda

Announcements

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Old Business

None

New Business

None

SITE PLANS

Old Business

1. Applicant: Crescent Beach Restaurant and Hotel, LLC
 Location: 1372, 1384 & 1390 Edgemere Drive
 Request: Site plan approval for the following changes to the site of an existing restaurant: addition of concrete patio on the north and east sides; revised parking lot layout; removal of an accessory structure (one-car garage); and related utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 2.6 acres

 Zoning District: BR (Restricted Business)
 Mon. Co. Tax No.: 035.09-1-21, 035.09-1-22, 035.09-1-23

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Richard Giraulo, LandTech/LaDieu Consulting, LLC, presented the application:

Mr. Giraulo: I have passed around an updated plan that shows some requests and notes from staff comments from the last few days. I will go through what is new. Essentially, we will be doing some work in the parking to remove asphalt and create some landscape areas. This will help to define Edgemere Drive, which it is now called by the Town's Traffic Advisory Committee. We also show a pavilion that has been added to the site plan. This will be a wood-frame-construction, open-air structure. It will be about 10 feet to the eaves, with a pitched roof and asphalt shingles. No enclosures on the sides; it probably will have vinyl that can come down on the sides when it's windy or rainy. Those are some of the main changes in the plans. We also have moved the fire hydrant, as requested by the Fire Marshal, and created a curbed island, which will protect the hydrant better. A fence is proposed along the west side; it is of open construction.

Mr. Copey: The Fire Marshal had no comments as of right now. Our Board of Zoning Appeals staff advisor has reviewed the proposal, and the proposed pavilion location will need a front setback variance, which is on the lake side of the site. We had some discussion regarding the side setback, whether it would be 15 or 20 feet. It's clear in our zoning code that the requirement is 15 feet, as long as this structure remains an open pavilion and not an enclosed structure. As a result, after the applicant builds the pavilion, it will not be able to be enclosed because it then would be classified as a building and would have different side setback requirements; there also might be other requirements.

Mr. Selke: While we are on that, does that include the gazebo?

Mr. Copey: I believe the gazebo has a setback variance. We will have to confirm that.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Giraulo: We had a bunch of variances that were granted through the years; the gazebo previously had a variance.

Mr. Copey: We had some comments from the Traffic Advisory Committee ("TAC"). What we have been referring to as Crescent Beach Drive actually called is Edgemere Drive. The TAC recommended that the proposed curbing that delineates the roadway and the parking lot islands, and any other structure of that sort, be moved outside the right-of-way easement. The TAC also had a comment about the crosswalk striping, but I think that the Board already wanted to talk more about that. We have asked for confirmation regarding the elevation of the breakwater structure that was rebuilt.

Mr. Giraulo: We shot the elevation breakwater; its elevation is at about 250.7 to 251.4 feet above sea level. The breakwater is made of rock, so it's not even; however, it is above the 250-foot elevation of the Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") floodplain.

Mr. Copey: Our building department asked for detail on the fence that is proposed along the west side of the site. We're glad to see this project in front of the Planning Board tonight. We have notified neighbors of the meeting. We feel that having this before the Board is a positive step forward, and we hope that we can bring this to a close.

Mr. Gauthier: We hope to get a complete review out in the next couple of days. We are looking for a drainage report discussion of how you drainage will be handled. We try to integrate the comments of the TAC with our other comments. The big thing is how you are going to address the drainage issue from a regulatory standpoint.

Marcia Clegg, 1412 Edgemere Drive: I live directly across from this open dump, as I call it. I have been so frustrated. Every time that we neighbors come to a Planning Board meeting about this site, it gets pulled from the agenda; I think that that is why most neighbors are not here. The Town decided to remove the pile of stone rubble that was in the parking lot; thank you. Right now, when I look out at the lake and look down toward that building, I see rats running around. I've seen people sleeping there in the summer. I've called the Town and no one does anything. The police department does not do anything. When will this project be finished?

Mr. Schiano: It's not the Town causing the delay; it's the applicant. They still are working on it. The Town can move only at the pace that the applicant sets.

Ms. Clegg: They have put the stone base in, on the west side. I talked to the owner, and the next day they were supposed to put concrete on it, but the Town stopped them.

Mr. Copey: They did not have approval to put concrete down; they did not have approval to put gravel down.

Mr. Fisher: The first step has to be the approval of a plan, and we have to be sure that it meets all local and state regulations. We hope that this project review will lead to that.

Ms. Clegg: Is it possible to put up a six-foot-high fence on the west side to buffer some late-night partying?

Mr. Sofia: We can ask them to describe what is proposed.

Ms. Clegg: What about the roadway? Is it possible to move it in case of emergencies?

Mr. Fisher: We have to ask the Town Fire Marshal to take a look at that and make recommendations and make sure that the emergency response equipment can get where it might have to go.

Ms. Clegg: When the Crescent Beach Restaurant was alive, we had a hard time getting down our road if they had a full house.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Fisher: Currently, it is difficult to tell where the road and the parking lot are; we are trying to make clear where the road is. They are going to have grass planted in the front so that the only vehicle access will be where the road will be; it then will be obvious where the road and the parking lot will be.

Ms. Clegg: Is there a parking lot across from me?

Mr. Fisher: That land is not owned by this applicant. I think that they have proposed to put up a fence there.

Kevin Cleary, 1432 Edgemere Drive: I'm confused as to why there is a road going through a parking lot that is an unsafe situation. We have been here multiple times and have all complained and they always come up with Band-Aid proposals. Why don't they move the road over and make it safer?

Mr. Fisher: The parcels to the west are not owned by the applicant. That roadway through the parking lot is existing, and they are going to put a fence up.

Mr. Cleary: How can the applicant come to a meeting when they are half-way done? They have leveled ground, they have put down stone for a patio that has not been approved yet, and they can't even empty the dumpster that I drive by every day and look at garbage. They have not even finished the siding. I don't make that much money, but I could have finished this project in two weeks. They don't do anything. They might talk a good game but ask any neighbor, it looks like a dump.

Mr. Fisher: The first step is to create a plan and bring it to a public forum such as this one.

Mr. Cleary: The same trash is from two years ago. If this guy was a contractor, he would have been fired. He's not producing what he said he was going to, he's not making progress, and he's not doing anything for the community. Frustration is an understatement. This parking lot is unsafe, and I can't see how the Board can approve this. Will there be "Stop" signs?

Mr. Copey: We and they are trying to define the roadway, in the interest of safety. This Planning Board review of a proposed plan is a step toward making that roadway safer. In addition, this additional access is also in the interest of emergency response. We are dealing with preexisting conditions. Please be patient. We share your frustration.

Mr. Cleary: If you think that this guy is going to put up a concrete patio and a pavilion, why hasn't he finished the drywall? It's been four years. I don't have faith in anything that they say. How long will it take to see it happen? It took suing them to get the pile of rocks moved out of the parking lot. I don't believe anything that they say. They don't even show up to a Planning Board meeting. It shows how much commitment to this community they have.

Ms. Clegg: Did you meet and give them permission to do this, three or four years ago?

Mr. Fisher: At that time, they obtained a special use permit to operate a restaurant. We have the same degree of frustration, looking for a plan that we can approve.

Mr. Schiano: They have not presented anything that addresses issues.

Mr. Selke: The Town Board has to approve a special use for the restaurant. Our job is to look at the site and make sure the site layout works.

Mr. Cleary: Am I allowed to put a 50-foot dumpster in my front yard and leave it?

Arthur Daughton, 52 Goethals Drive: I use to be a friend of Joe's, and it's the 50-year anniversary. I have met the owners and have taken photos. This parking lot used to be accessible. Is this area owned by the DEC?

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Copey: It is a public road; it is not owned by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation.

Mr. Daughton: Now you are asking this guy to put in all this stuff in here when it was never asked for before. I get that, I also see the amount of money that is in this project. I tried all day to get a hold of him all day. The fact remains that his goal is open by Christmas. This a great opportunity for the community. You should not get upset if he's trying to control the road. Let's work together. They we are part of the same team.

Doug Dobson, 1630 Edgemere Drive: I have probably lived on that street the longest, I have seen many changes, and the speed at which cars shoot out of that parking lot from that site is very concerning. Even during the day, I have seen little children almost get hit. It's a step in the right direction. Is the proposed roadway in the exact location where it is right now?

Mr. Schiano: Yes. They are the same easements have been described.

Mr. Dobson: Just in case you forgot, there is a catch basin in the existing right-of-way, so drainage on this site will be a problem. When the road was redone, they made us connect into the new storm system; I'm not allowed to pump into the lake. I have observed this proposed site and the pumping system which is discharging into the lake. I'm not sure whether that will continue to be allowed or not when they make the proper changes. I also will ask about light spill and properties to the east. Now the pavilion be a plastic shelter?

Mr. Fisher: It sounds like it will be a wood top with columns, and in inclement weather they may roll some vinyl sides down, but there will not be permanent sites.

Mr. Dobson: What is the dark gray shown on the map?

Mr. Copey: It's a paved area that will be repaved.

Mr. Dobson: That does mean the rest of the lot won't be repaved?

Mr. Copey: My understanding is that they will patch and seal and stripe on top.

Mr. Dobson: It won't be too attractive to go to a restaurant if you have a mishmash of a parking lot. Near the curve to the north, it shows employee parking. I would like to point out that, in the past, that area has been used for stacking cars. It is difficult for emergency vehicles to get down the road. The plan also shows a walkway; it is hard to see people in that area. There is another storage building there and it is used for garbage as well; it was pointed out to the Town and they have removed them. It does not appear that the owner maintains it at all. The adjacent property that has the parking on it, what's to prevent people from parking there? How is it zoned?

Mr. Copey: It is zoned commercial.

Mr. Dobson: How does the change in use apply to someone else that bought the land?

Mr. Copey: The special use permit that was granted for the restaurant did not include that area; the special use permit has expired.

Mr. Schiano: If the person who owns that land leased it to the restaurant to allow them to use it for parking, it would have to be part of the new special use permit; the special use permit is specific. The applicant is proposing to put a fence along that west property line as well, so there won't be any crisscrossing there, and we can control third parties.

Mr. Dobson: I would also ask that you give some thought to the green area and that it be elevated relative to the parking lot and to Edgemere Drive.

Mr. Selke: I know that the neighbors are concerned about excess parking in that neighborhood. We are going to ask about that.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Sofia: Are there any code violations currently?

Mr. Copey: I don't know about currently, but the property owner has been cited for violations in the past. They can ask for a waiver to extend the special use permit.

Mr. Sofia: The curbing along Edgemere Drive stops; I don't see why it can't be continued. This property has been used as a cut-through and people have abused it, so I would certainly propose this be continued on the property line.

Mr. Giraulo: That is county property.

Mr. Copey: It's up to the Monroe County Department of Transportation ("MCDOT").

Mr. Sofia: If we could get the MCDOT to agree, we should take those steps to get the curbing there. We also should require that the parking lot be up to standards as far as proper patching and coating. The curve concerns me. I know that the plan shows raised curbs, but it still is a concern. The walkway leads to nowhere, there will be people crossing traffic, and some of the parking spaces result in vehicles backing out of them into traffic. You have 11 parking spaces more than required.

Mr. Schiano: Is that the whole building, including the upper floor?

Mr. Giraulo: It's the whole building.

Mr. Sofia: The total floor space is about 9,000 square feet.

Mr. Copey: That is first and second floors together.

Mr. Sofia: So, if nothing has changed you have 11 parking spaces extra. If you eliminated the 19 parking spaces that are west of the access roadway and moved that roadway all the way to west and eliminated the crosswalk, you would regain some parking spaces to the west and could extend the landscape island and this make the area better.

Mr. Giraulo: We are going back around in a circle. We have been through this discussion in the past, and we have to live with where the right-of-way easement is. It's not perfect, but the owner is not willing to move the road.

Mr. Sofia: We need to do something better.

Mr. Barletta: There appears to be enough room in the drive aisle to put curbing around the curve, and you would have enough room for employee parking.

Mr. Sofia: This will prevent traffic from heading east on Edgemere Drive.

Mr. Giraulo: So, you're saying, put curb in the middle, with pavement on the side. I need at least 20 feet for vehicles to have sufficient space to back up. We can look at it.

Mr. Selke: How do you account for the parking needed for the outdoor seating?

Mr. Copey: The zoning ordinance doesn't account for that. I don't know that eliminating parking will be beneficial. We have an undefined area. If you could define the lane near the building and define how it comes into the roadway, it would help.

Mr. Antelli: Could you put a guard rail there?

Mr. Giraulo: The trouble with a guard rail is that you can't see it.

Mr. Antelli: I'm not going to drive over a guard rail.

Mr. Giraulo: We are improving the hazard that has been there for more than 50 years.

Mr. Sofia: To stand in front of us and to do less than our job in anticipation of the applicant walking away from the project is not a reason for us to not to do what we are supposed to.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Giraulo: This is plan shows what the Board previously asked us to do. We will take a look at your new ideas.

Mr. Fisher: This is akin to a shopping center, where you have people crossing a drive aisle. One way to control traffic is to put up a "Stop" sign.

Mr. Giraulo: We have put up some "Yield" signs.

Mr. Selke: What about site lighting?

Mr. Giraulo: The lights are on the plans. The fixtures might be changed, but no new poles are planned.

Mr. Sofia: Who approves the pavilion? You're saying this is not taken into account for determining parking requirements?

Mr. Copey: We don't include outdoor seating in determining the parking requirements. I see your point, but I can't see two weddings happening at the same time at this site.

Mr. Fisher: I could see that happening. It's why we want to retain as many parking spaces as possible.

Mr. Selke: Does the applicant see a need to increase the amount of parking?

Mr. Giraulo: I would hope that he's looking at trying to acquire the adjacent properties at some point in time, so that he could expand on the amount of parking.

Mr. Selke: The front steps have a lot of missing areas. You might want to put up a railing in the middle of those steps. The walkway has to be put in a place that works for handicapped parking spaces. The canopy needs more lighting. On the east, there are two trees. Will those be taken out? There is a fence. Whose fence is that? Will the storage shed be removed? Where will they keep tools?

Mr. Giraulo: The trees will stay. The fence belongs to the neighbor. I imagine that the owner will hire out for maintenance, and not need tools. The buffer to the west will be arborvitae. We are in the process of getting a landscaper on board; we will check with them.

Mr. Selke: The dumpster is right in front. How can we do a better job of screening that? How will deliveries be handled?

Mr. Giraulo: There are doors there, they just need to be closed. I'm guessing that deliveries will come at off hours, not when the restaurant is open for customers.

Mr. Fisher: I think that, if the landscaping along Edgemere Drive is to keep folks off that area, you should put low landscaping there.

Mr. Giraulo: Again, that area belongs to the county highway right-of-way, the MCDOT will dictate what we can and can't do there; we can have a discussion with them.

Mr. Fisher: Once you have grass, it will signify that you can't park there.

Mr. Giraulo: That will probably be a bio-retention area for storm water runoff quality. We hope that this will prevent people from driving there.

Mr. Fisher: There was discussion at one point that there was a gas line that was going to be heading to the north end, close to the neighbor to the east. Was that gas line put in?

Mr. Giraulo: I think that it was taken out.

Mr. Fisher: So, there is no intent to putting in a permanent gas line?

Mr. Giraulo: Correct.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Fisher: We need to put some delineation at the curve, so that people know that this area is occupied by pedestrians.

Mr. Dobson: One idea that we had to discourage parking was to put in boulders. Who owns the property to the east?

Mr. Fisher: Not the owner of Crescent Beach.

Mr. Sofia: We would like to see elevations of the pavilion.

Mr. Giraulo: OK.

Motion by Mr. Antelli, seconded by Mr. Barletta, to continue the application to the January 20, 2016, meeting, as requested by the applicant.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Absent	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

**MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION CONTINUED
TO JANUARY 20, 2016, MEETING**

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

New Business

None

SPECIAL PLANNING TOPICS

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: ZCJ Automotive, Inc.
Location: 4498-4536 West Ridge Road
Request: Minor improvement plan approval for a minor alteration of a previously approved site plan, to replace an existing building with a new building (one story; 6245± square feet) and an open structure (800± square feet), instead of remodeling the existing building, with related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on approximately 10.44 acres
Zoning District: BG (General Business)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.01-01-18.2, 073.01-01-20, 073.01-01-21.1, and 073.01-01-23

The following is a synopsis of the discussion pertaining to the above-referenced request:

Michael Montalto, Costich Engineering, presented the application:

Mr. Montalto: We were here last November for a modification. Looking at the existing building, we were going to put an addition on the rear and renovate the front of the building. When they were preparing to build, it turned out that portions of the existing building were on fill, and the amount of earth that would have to be undercut would compromise the building. The current plan changes things by knocking down the front of the existing building and rebuilding it. We have met with Town staff, and we have moved the new building back to avoid the need for any setback variances. There are provisions on the plan that give us the ability to add a future covered service area, which is not being constructed now. In terms of floor area, on the previous approved site plan, the building had 10,600 square feet; we now are at 12,915 square feet, with the future drive-up service bay at an additional 3,100 square feet. The building elevations show the same theme as before, with the silver and glass, but is more cohesive with the building squarer. We are proposing a paving wall, paving surface all around. We lost one parking space and one tree. We have a better layout, a flatter area, and the interconnectivity works better.

Mr. Fisher: I think that you have ended up finding the best place to put the building; it allows for better traffic flow. It is a tremendous improvement from what we had before, a benefit to the applicant, and a benefit to the people who are going to use the site.

Mr. Montalto: They spent a fair amount of time trying to fix the problems with the existing building but in the long run this turns out to be better all the way around. If they were to decide that they wanted the covered area, the provision for that has been made.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Copey: Our zoning staff advisor states that the setback now complies with code. He mentioned that there was a sign proposed. We had no other comments from the Town's building department staff, the Fire Marshal, or our engineering staff. This plan came in as a minor improvement plan, based on the provision that it was a minor alteration to a previously approved site plan. The heavy lifting has been done for the site. The conditions of approval that I have prepared are the same as from the previous approval, with the exception of removing things that already have been accomplished.

Mr. Selke: I agree with the Chairman. This plan is an improvement over the previous one. Will there be a basement in the building?

Mr. Montalto: No. That is the bad soil that we have to bring up to grade.

Mr. Selke: There are trees shown in the grassy area but they are not installed yet.

Mr. Montalto: Nothing on the previous plan has changed, except for the building. The parking lot is now connected all at grade, and has an improved route to show the inventory.

Mr. Barletta: Since you have moved the dumpster, is there enough room to get around it?

Mr. Montalto: We have 30 feet of pavement.

Motion by Mr. Selke, seconded by Mr. Barletta:

WHEREAS ZCJ Automotive, Inc. (the "Applicant") has submitted a proposal (the "Proposal") to the Town of Greece (the "Town") Planning Board (the "Planning Board") for approval of a minor improvement plan, as more fully described in the minutes of this public meeting, relative to property generally located at 4498-4536 West Ridge Road (the "Premises"); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board makes the following findings:

1. Upon review of the Proposal, the Planning Board determined that the Proposal is subject to the State Environmental Quality Review Act (New York State Environmental Conservation Law, Article 8) and its implementing regulations (6 NYCRR Part 617, the "SEQRA Regulations") (collectively, "SEQRA"), and that the Proposal constitutes an Unlisted action under SEQRA.
2. The Planning Board has considered the Proposal at a public meeting (the "Meeting") in the Greece Town Hall, One Vince Tofany Boulevard, at which time all parties in interest and citizens were afforded an opportunity to be heard.
3. Documentary, testimonial, and other evidence were presented at the Meeting relative to the Proposal for the Planning Board's consideration.
4. The Planning Board has carefully considered environmental information that was prepared by the Applicant's representatives or the Town's staff, which included but was not limited to: descriptions; maps; drawings; analyses; reports; reviews; aerial photographs; and Part 1 of an Environmental Assessment Form (the "EAF") (collectively, the "Environmental Analysis").
5. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered additional information and various oral or written comments that may have resulted from meetings with or written correspondence from the Applicant's representatives.
6. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

various involved and interested agencies, including but not limited to the Monroe County Department of Planning and Development and the Town's own staff.

7. The Planning Board also has included in the Environmental Analysis and has carefully considered information, recommendations, and comments that may have resulted from telephone conversations or meetings with or written correspondence from owners of nearby properties or other interested parties, and all other relevant comments submitted to the Planning Board as of this date.
8. The Environmental Analysis examined the relevant issues associated with the Proposal.
9. The Planning Board has completed Parts 2 and 3 of the EAF, and has carefully considered the information contained therein.
10. The Planning Board has met the procedural and substantive requirements of SEQRA.
11. The Planning Board has carefully considered each and every criterion for determining the potential significance of the Proposal and the Project upon the environment, as set forth in SEQRA.
12. The Planning Board has carefully considered (that is, has taken the required "hard look" at) the Proposal and the Project and the relevant environmental impacts, facts, and conclusions disclosed in the Environmental Analysis.
13. The Planning Board concurs with the information and conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis.
14. The Planning Board has made a reasoned elaboration of the rationale for arriving at its determination of environmental significance and the Planning Board's determination is supported by substantial evidence, as set forth herein.
15. To the maximum extent practicable, potential adverse environmental impacts revealed in the environmental review process will be avoided or minimized by the Applicant's voluntary incorporation of mitigation measures that were identified as practicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED that, pursuant to SEQRA, based on the aforementioned information, documentation, testimony, and findings, and after examining the relevant issues, the Planning Board's own initial concerns, and all relevant issues raised and recommendations offered by involved and interested agencies and the Town's own staff, the Planning Board determines that the Proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, which constitutes a negative declaration.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Absent	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Mr. Sofia then made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to approve the Proposal, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall develop the Premises in conformity with all details of the Proposal as presented in the written descriptions and site development plans, as orally presented to the Planning Board, and as set forth herein. In the event of any conflict among the oral or written descriptions of the proposal, the site development plans of the proposal, or the requirements or restrictions of this resolution, the Applicant agrees that the Planning Board shall determine the resolution of such dispute.
2. Any Town of Greece approval or permit for the Premises does not relieve the Applicant, developer, or owner of the Premises from obtaining all other town, county, state, or federal government approvals or permits that are required for the Premises. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
3. The landscaping on the Premises shall be maintained by the current owner of the Premises, and by any future owner. The owner of the Premises shall replace any dead plants with the same species or a similar species. The replacement plant shall be no smaller than the previous plant when it originally was installed. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
4. Prior to the issuance of a Final Certificate of Occupancy for the Premises, The Applicant shall provide certification verifying proper installation of landscape areas on the site in accordance with the landscape plan approved by the Planning Board, and in accordance with the Town's Landscape Guidelines for Development. Such certification shall be on the certification form provided in such guidelines and shall be completed by a New York State Licensed Landscape Architect. A note that indicates these requirements shall be added to the plan.
5. All heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment shall be screened from public view. If the HVAC equipment is or will be roof-mounted, the screening for such HVAC equipment shall be visually compatible with the proposed building(s), and shall be shown on the architectural elevations of the building(s). If the HVAC equipment is or will be ground-mounted, its location shall be shown on the site plan. Evidence that such HVAC equipment is or will be screened shall be submitted for review and approval by the Clerk of the Planning Board prior to affixing the Planning Board approval signature to the site plan.
6. The exterior appearance (that is, materials, colors, and architectural style) of the proposed addition shall be the same on all sides of the proposed addition and shall be visually compatible with the existing building. As offered and agreed by the Applicant, such materials and colors shall be exterior insulation and finishing system ("EIFS") (in the silver color family) as presented this evening. Elevations of the exterior appearance shall identify these colors and materials, shall show all sides of the existing building and proposed addition, and shall be filed with the site plan.
7. Light spill shall be contained on the Premises. Outdoor light sources shall be aimed or shielded so that they are not visible when viewed from off the Premises, and so that light spill is cast only downward onto the Premises. Exempt from this requirement are low-wattage or low-voltage lights that are located near the principal entrance to a building, and low-wattage or low-voltage lights, not higher than 42 inches above grade, that define a walkway or other access to a building. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
8. The number of parking spaces required by the Town's zoning ordinance shall be shown on the plan.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

9. Snow storage areas shall be identified on the plan.
10. The locations of the designated fire lanes shall be shown on the Site Plan.
11. Permanently mounted "No Parking – Fire Lane" signs shall be posted along the fire lanes at intervals of 50 feet or less, as may be directed by the Fire Marshal. A note that indicates this requirement shall be added to the plan.
12. The locations of all exterior doors shall be shown on the plan. All exterior doors shall be connected by a sidewalk to an acceptable fire safety zone.
13. No pre-construction meeting shall be scheduled unless and until a Notice of Intent (NOI) has been filed with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (the "NYSDEC").

Throughout the life of the storm water permit (from the filing of the Notice of Intent to the Notice of Termination), the developer shall comply fully with all aspects of the NYSDEC General Permit No. GP-10-001, particularly Part IV, which describes:

- periodic inspections of the construction site by a qualified professional; and
- maintenance of a site log; and
- stabilization requirements; and
- Maintenance of sediment traps and ponds during construction.

The periodic inspection reports shall be provided to the Town's engineering staff within 24 hours of inspections.

14. No building permits shall be issued unless and until a digital copy of the plans has been submitted. All sheets in the drawing set, with all necessary signatures, shall be provided in Tagged Image File (".TIF") format at a minimum resolution of 400 dpi.
15. Subject to approval by the Town's Fire Marshal, Commissioner of Public Works, and Deputy Commissioner of Public Works for Engineering.
16. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific applicant, developer, operator, or property owner, it shall be construed to include any successors and assigns.
17. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific public official or agency, it shall be construed to include designees, successors and assigns.
18. Wherever this resolution refers to a specific law, ordinance, code, rule, or regulation, it shall be construed to include any succeeding or superseding authority.
19. As offered and agreed to by the Applicant, the handicapped spaces shall be located on the east side of the building subject to approval by the Planning Board Clerk.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Absent	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
APPLICATION APPROVED
WITH CONDITIONS

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

2. Applicant: RED-Rochester, LLC
- Location: Generally, in Eastman Business Park (near southeast corner of
 Technology Boulevard and Chemical Imaging Loop)
- Request: Extension of site plan approval for a proposed natural gas-
 powered electricity generation plant (consisting of three
 proposed buildings – 13,500 square feet, 1850 square feet,
 1800 square feet), previously approved March 4, 2015, with
 related parking, utilities, grading, and landscaping, on
 approximately 1.0 acres
- Zoning District: IG (Industrial)
- Mon. Co. Tax No.: 090.50-1-14.11

Motion by Mr. Barletta, seconded by Mr. Antelli, to grant two 90-day extensions of the site plan approval previously granted on March 4, 2015.

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Absent	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

MOTION CARRIED
TWO 90-DAY EXTENSIONS GRANTED

REZONING RECOMMENDATION:

Old Business

None

New Business

1. Applicant: Ralph Automotive, Inc.
Location: 7, 11, 15 Elmgrove Road and adjacent lands
Request: Rezone 2.66± acres to BG (General Business)
Zoning District: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)
Mon. Co. Tax No.: 073.04-1-3, 073.04-1-4, 073.04-1-5, and 073.04

The site is located south of West Ridge Road, immediately west of Elmgrove Road.

Currently, the site is zoned R1-18 (Single-family residential).

The applicant proposes to rezone approximately 2.66 acres from R1-18 (Single-Family Residential) to BG (General Business) in order to expand the existing car dealer parking lot and to accommodate possible future expansion of the dealership.

The site is surrounded by the following zoning and land uses:

North: BG (General Business)—the existing Ralph Honda Dealership.

South: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)—Existing residential structures and vacant land.

East: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)—Elmgrove Road, and Ridgemont Country Club.

West: R1-18 (Single-Family Residential)—Existing residential structures and vacant land.

Town of Greece Master Plan recommendation:

1. Improve transitions between land uses.
2. Use green space as a transition between uses.

Consider:

- Is the proposal in agreement with the Master Plan? Yes. The proposed BG zoning district is consistent with West Ridge Road, which is the town's main commercial corridor.
- Would the proposal provide a transition in use or buffering? Adequate buffering should be provided for any future commercial expansion.
- Is the parcel suitable for the proposed use (e.g., size, shape, access)? Yes, if buffering is provided.
- Will this set a precedent in the area? No. The other properties on the north side of West Ridge Road already are zoned BG.
- What is the best type of use for this land? Commercial.

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

Planning Issues:

- Utilities—existing.
- Site Design—existing.
- Buffering—will be reviewed when future development is presented.

Motion by Mr. Sofia, seconded by Mr. Barletta, to recommend rezoning of 2.66± acres to BG (General Business).

VOTE:	Antelli	Yes	Barletta	Yes
	Burke	Absent	Helfer	Yes
	Selke	Yes	Sofia	Yes
	Fisher	Yes		

RECOMMENDATION MADE

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
December 16, 2015

CODE ENFORCEMENT

ADJOURNMENT: 9:12 p.m.

APPROVAL OF PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

The Planning Board of the Town of Greece, in the County of Monroe and State of New York, rendered the above decisions.

Signed: _____

Alvin I. Fisher, Jr., Chairman

Date: _____